

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Exercise dose-response relationship with heart rate variability in individuals with overweight and obesity: Protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials
AUTHORS	Sinha, Mukesh; Maiya, G Arun; Moga, Ana; KN, Shivashankar; Shankar N, Ravi; k, vaishali

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Carl Lavie The University of Queensland School of Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	18-May-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The study is fine , but I am not certain that this will be super impactful. Also, I am not sure why a methods paper is needed when this could all be included in the full paper. Nevertheless , I see no reason that this cannot be published , especially in Open Access.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Preman Kumarathurai Rigshospitalet, Department of Cardiology
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Jun-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The manuscript is a protocol for a metaanalysis/systemic review of RCTs of studies assessing HRV in relation to exercise-dose response in individuals with overweight/obesity.</p> <p>The protocol seems well-planned. I have only minor comments to the protocol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The paper was submitted on the 14th of December 2020, but is first available for review now (May 2021). What is the reason for such a delay?- Some estimated dates for the various procedures could be mentioned? E.g. retrieving papers, manuscript writing.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Response to reviewer 1:

We appreciate the reviewer's constructive feedback on the manuscript. We appreciate the time you took to assist us in improving this manuscript. Dear reviewer, this protocol was developed and meant to be more methodologically refined, therefore we initially considered publishing it as a protocol. We appreciate your thoughtful input. Thank you

Response to reviewer 2:

We thank reviewer for the critical comments on the manuscript. We do appreciate the time you have spent in helping us to improve this manuscript. We have modified the manuscript as per the suggestion. The changes are highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer comment: Some estimated dates for the various procedures could be mentioned? E.g. retrieving papers, manuscript writing.

Response: Modified as per suggestion (Page no. 8, line no. 135). The changes are highlighted in the manuscript.